

UNITED STATES | ENGLAND | GERMANY | CHINA

DARA D. MANN dmann@faegre.com (612) 766-7089

ATLANTA OFFICE: 678-627-8190

June 29, 2007

Richard T. Garren Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen, Orbison & Lewis 502 West Sixth Street Tulsa, OK 74119 EMAIL / ORIGINAL AND ENCLOSURES VIA FEDEX OVERNIGHT

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson, et al.

Dear Rick:

Enclosed please find one CD containing our 7th production of documents (CARTP095365-CARTP123573) representing the Cargill Defendants' production of ESI as outlined in my June 26, 2007 letter to Trevor Hammons. ¹ Also enclosed are confidentiality and redaction logs for this production. Further provided with this letter is a second CD containing an Excel spreadsheet with source information for each document and an identification of the document request(s) the Cargill Defendants believe each document to correspond based upon a preliminary review.

We will forward the Cargill Defendants' privilege log associated with this production on Monday, July 2nd. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding this production.

Sincerely,

Dara D. Mann

EXHIBIT

17

MANDD:speqc

¹ Given the July 2nd deadline for production of ESI, this production is temporally limited to the time period 2002 forward. Upon receipt of the Court's Order regarding the appropriate temporal scope of discovery, the Cargill Defendants will begin the process of supplementing its productions and addressing temporal redactions consistent with that Order for this ESI production as well as for all prior productions.

Page 2 of 47

Richard T. Garren June 29, 2007 Page 2

cc: Trevor Hammons (via email only, w/o enclosures)
Theresa Noble Hill (w/enclosures)

fb.us.2150266.02

RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

GREGORY W. ALBERTY
REBECCA V. AMENT
JACK R. NDERSON
ST
THOMAS M. ASKEW
Z.
THOMAS M. ASKEW
Z.
THOMAS M. BOYLE
JE ST
JONALD M. BINCHAM
MILLIAM A SOWLES
REST
REST
ST
JONALD M. BINCHAM
MILLIAM A SOWLES
REST
JONALD M. CONTEN
DERRICKO, CORNELO
DERRICKO,

STEPHEN E. HALE
MELVIRI C. HALL
GHARON E. HAMM
SACHERY R. HARGIS
CHRISTOPHEN S. HEROUX
JERRI L. HILL
HOLLY M. HILLERMAN
ERIK S. HOUGHTON
ROBERT E. HOWARD
WAL GREGORY JAMES
STEVEN JANISZEWSKI
KIEMONN L. JONES
SARAH G. KIENY
KRISTOPHEN E. KOEPSEL
TERRY D. KORDELISKI, I
G. GUANE LEE
JOSEPH P. LEDNART
TERRY D. KORDELISKI, I
G. SI LEWS, I
G.

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW FRISCO BUILDING 502 WEST SIXTH STREET TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74119-1010 (918) 587-3161 Fax (918) 587-9708

July 2, 2007

GLOYD L MCCDY
RAYMOND A MELTON
RICHARD A MILDREN
GUSAR MONAMEDBHAI
J. LYON MOREHEAD
J. LYON MOREHEAD
J. LYON MOREHEAD
J. LYON MOREHEAD
ANGE LORAN MORROW
ROBERT A NANCE
GARY L. NEL
MARK L. NELMS
MARGARET A NUNNERY
SHAWN C. O'BUCKLEY
JAMES C. ORBISON
NICOLE J. PETTY
JAMES G. POGIMON
NICOLE J. PETTY
JAMES R. POLAN
RICHARD P. POGRMON
RICHARD P. POGRMON
DAVID L. FRICE
RICHARD P. POGRMON
DAVID L. FRICE
KICHARD P. POGRMON
RICHARD P. POGRMON
RICHARD P. POGRMON
RICHARD P. RICHEY
RICHARD P. MAINE
GARRIELA N. BANDOVAL
VILLIAM C. BEARCY
KRISTEN E. RANDOVAL
VILLIAM C. BEARCY
KRISTEN E. RANDOVAL
KRISTEN E. BANDOVAL
KRISTEN E. BANDOV

KENNETH M. SMITH
SCOTT D. SMITH
BETTY J. SOMMARS
EEVERLY A. STEWART
CHRISTOPHER B. SWAISON
STEPHANIE C. THEBAN
HARLEY W. THOMAS
HEX. W. THOMAS
HEX. W. THOMAS
HEX. W. THOMAS
HEX. W. THOMPSON
SONLA M. TREI
MICHAEL T. LATER
LINIA VAN ARREL GRUDEL
KAREN CARDEN WALSH
SHARON K. WEAVER
JOSEPH R. WELLG
BRIAN B. WILKERSON
DOUGLAS A. WASON
JERRY L. WITT
MICHAEL P. WOMACK
COURTNEY M. WOLIN
GARY W. WOOD
TRACY S. ZAHL

Of Counsel Benjamin P. Abney E. Bryan Henson Peter J. Regan

To all Counsel: Via E-mail

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et.al Case Number: 05-CV-325 GKF (SAJ)

EXHIBIT
_____18

Dear Counsel:

The State is providing the following for your copying and inspection. The State will provide you access to these databases and will have technical personnel on hand to help with your search. The State's production of July 2, 2007 contains the following:

- Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment
 Electronic Files and Reports (Reports, drafts, spreadsheets and PDF documents)
- 2. Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (Grower, Complaints and Applicator Microsoft Access Databases)
- Oklahoma Conservation Commission GIS file (standard ARC viewer)
- Oklahoma Scenic Rivers
 Electronic Files, Reports and E-Mails (those E-mails identified and reviewed for privilege and responsiveness to date)
- 5. Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Aquarius Database, Bacti Database, FishCom Database, Pesticide-Metals Database, ArkOK P Loading Excel spreadsheets. See attached instructions for accessing the Aquarius and Bacti databases.
- Oklahoma Water Resources Board Electronic Files and Reports
- 7. A list of all publicly available information on State websites and the ESI contained thereon.

July 2, 2007 Page 2

Due to concerns regarding the accessibility of the databases for OWRB (ORACLE) and OCC (SQL 7), those will be made available for your inspection at the respective agencies at a mutually agreeable time. Further attached to this letter are the addresses for publicly available information upon which the Plaintiffs will rely or which are responsive to the production requests by the Poultry Integrator Defendants.

The other ESI production will be produced through RLS in Tulsa. The individual Poultry Integrator Defendants can make arrangements with RLS to provide as many copies of the State's ESI production as desired. Hard drives, some of which were too small for this production will be sent to RLS so that they are available to you. The contact information for RLS is (918) 583-3353. Should you have any difficulties with this arrangement please contact Louis Bullock or Richard Garren.

If for any reason you cannot access any file or run any databases the State is more than willing to work with you in order so that you may properly access these databases. The State is continuing to identify and review for privilege and responsiveness ESI at these agencies and the remaining agencies. The State will supplement its production as documents are identified and reviewed.

Yours very truly,

RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS P.C.

Richard Garren

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & GABLE, P.L.L.C. LAWYERS

ONEOK Plaza 100 West 5th Street, Suite 400 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-4287 Telephone (918) 582-1173 Fax (918) 592-3390 www.rhodesokla.com

Mailing Address P.O Box 21100 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100 Chris L. Rhodes, III Bert M. Jones John H. Tucker Jo Anne Deaton Dan S. Folluo Ann E. Allison Andrew D. Downing Bradley A. Jackson Colin H. Tucker

Kerry R. Lewis Leslie J. Southerland Nathan E. Clark Theresa Noble Hill Carlye O. Jimerson Bradley S. Shelfs Lindsay J. McDowell Denelda L. Richardson Maria E. Cervantes

Hai Crouch (1902-1947) Chris L. Rhodes (1902-1966) E. D. Hieronymus (1908-1994) George W. Gable (1918-2000)

--- Est. 1931 --

Daniel D. Draper, III James D. Johnson Of Counsel

Reply to: Theresa Noble Hill thill@rhodesokla.com

Via Email and Mail

July 12, 2007

Richard T. Garren Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis, Inc. 502 W. 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74101

J. Trevor Hammons State of Oklahoma Assistant Attorney General 313 NE 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson, et al.

Dear Trevor and Rick:

I am writing on behalf of all of the defense ESI liaisons to request a prompt meet and confer with the State to discuss: ESI that the State provided to RLS on July 3, 2007; ESI that the State advises it will make available for inspection at a mutually agreeable time; and ESI that the State did not provide on July 2, 2007. Other Defendants may also be writing separately to address their individual concerns.

Please be prepared to address the following specific issues and questions:

1) Has the State completed its document production for OSRC, ODEQ, OWRC, OSE, and OKCC?

We understand that your privilege review is continuing and additional ESI from the above-referenced agencies will be made available. See E-mail from Richard Garren to Theresa Hill dated July 3, 2007, "More is being privileged reviewed and will be provided as it is available."

Richard T. Garren J. Trevor Hammons July 12, 2007 Page 2

On April 27, 2007, all Parties represented to Judge Joyner that they would make their ESI production no later than July 2, 2007. On June 21, 2007, the State advised that it would make an ESI production for OSRC, ODEQ, OWRB, OSE, and OKCC only. We did not agree to this unilateral limitation of the ESI production, but nonetheless Judge Joyner allowed the State another 30 days to complete its ESI production at the remaining agencies at the June 28, 2007. At the June 28, 2007 hearing, there was no discussion of further limiting the ESI production from the initial five agencies on July 2, 2007. Please be prepared to address what has been provided to RLS from the five agencies, what has not been provided to RLS and a timetable for the production of the remaining responsive ESI from these agencies.

Will the State provide the Defendants with the information necessary to identify the ESI responsive to each Defendants discovery requests?

a) Native Format

The Defendants did not request that the State provide their production in native format. Instead, we asked the State to provide its ESI in a reasonably useable form. During our June 22, 2007 teleconference, several of the Defendants expressed their concerns about determining what is responsive to each Defendants' specific requests in light of the State's proposed method of production. We were assured that the precise information, queries and technical support necessary to identify ESI specifically responsive to a specific Defendants' requests would be provided. It appears that the State is retracting from the assurances made on June 22, 2007. Will the State provide queries or other information necessary to identify ESI responsive to specific Defendants' requests?

b) ODEQ and ODAFF Databases

While the State provided access to these databases through RLS, the State has made no attempt to provide any information to the Defendants on how to access ESI responsive to their specific requests from these databases. Additionally, if the State intends to rely upon any information contained in these databases, it has not identified such information pursuant to FED.R.CIV.P, Rule 26(a)(1).

c) OWRB and OKCC Databases

The Defendants object to the State's eleventh hour disclosure that these databases will be made available at a "mutually agreeable time and place." We continue to request that the State provide the specific information from these databases that it intends to rely upon or that is responsive to the specific discovery request of a Defendant. The review of hard-documents at the agencies commenced in November, 2006 and still is not complete. We cannot agree to extend the ESI production to some unknown date in the future.

Richard T. Garren J. Trevor Hammons July 12, 2007

Page 3

d) Publicly Available Information

We are reviewing the list of publicly-available information. From our initial review, it is clear that the State has not identified what is responsive to the Defendants' discovery requests and what it intends to rely upon. Furthermore, there is a tremendous amount of information that is not related to the IRW. Please be prepared to discuss identifying information responsive to the Defendants' requests, what the State intends to rely upon and information specific to the IRW.

Will the State incur the costs for copying the State's files onto the hard-drives provided by Defendants?

The Defendants advise that they object to the State's unilateral decision to send their ESI and the Defendants' hard-drives to RLS and advise Defendants of this decision on July 2, 2007, the deadline for producing ESI, after 5:00 p.m. The State first advised that some of the hard-drives were not large enough for the State's ESI. However, every hard-drive provided was larger than the 80 GB of ESI provided to RLS. We are still curious why the State failed to make their production on July 2, 2007 on the hard-drives provided. The State has not responded to our inquiry whether it will incur the costs for copying the ESI to the hard-drives provided.

We look forward to a prompt meeting with you to address these initial issues. We are anxious to move forward and obtain the State's complete ESI production. Further delays will continue to impact the Defendants' ability to prepare their defense in this case in accordance with the Scheduling Order.

Sincerely,

THERESA 1

TNH:law

cc: ESI defense liaisons

Theresa Noble Hill

From: Richard Garren [RGarren@riggsabney.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 5:09 PM

To: Theresa Noble Hill

Cc: Bob Nance; dpage@edbelllaw.com; David Riggs; Doug Wilson; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Elizabeth

Ward; Fred Baker; Jean Burnett; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch : Lee Heath; Louis Bullock; Melissa Carr; Randall Miller; Richard Garren; Sharon Gentry; Sharon Weaver; Tina Izadi; Trevor Hammons

Subject: RE: State ESI production

Theresa,

- 1. Yes
- 2. N/A More is being privileged reviewed and will be provided as it is available.
- 3. See 2.
- 4. As stated previously, under rule 34(b)(ii) the State's ESI is being produced in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a form or forms that are reasonably useable.
 - 5. At this time, additional privilege review is occurring for more to be produced.
- 6. My letter did not say that. A list of publicly available data bases was omitted but provided in subsequent email. Instruction relating to accessibility of DEQ's databases will be furnished.

Rick

From: Theresa Noble Hill [mailto:THill@rhodesokla.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 3:15 PM

To: Richard Garren; Scott McDaniel; Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Dara Mann; David Senger; Delmar Ehrich; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; James Graves; Jay Jorgensen; Jennifer Griffin; John Elrod; John Tucker; Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee; Lawrence Zeringue; Lori A. White; Michael Bond; Nicole Longwell; P. Joshua Wisley; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Robert George; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Sherry P. Bartley; Vicki Bronson

Cc: Bob Nance; dpage@edbelllaw.com; David Riggs; Doug Wilson; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Elizabeth Ward; Fred Baker; Jean Burnett; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Lee Heath; Louis Bullock; Melissa Carr; Randall Miller; Sharon Gentry; Sharon Weaver; Tina Izadi; Trevor Hammons; Jinger Waller; Colin H. Tucker; Lori A. White; Candy J. Smith

Subject: RE: State ESI production

Rick,

We share Scott's concerns and questions. In addition to his initial questions, can you please provide us with clarification of your July 2, 2007 letter as follows:

- 1) Has the ESI at the various agencies generally described on Page 1 of your letter been provided to RLS?
- 2) If not, what has been provided to RLS?
- 3) If not, what is your proposal with respect to obtaining this ESI from the agencies described on Page 1 of your letter?
- 4) Are the queries to obtain ESI specific to Cargill's discovery contained in the production at RLS?
- 5) Is OSRC the only agency from which e-mails are being produced?

State ESI production

Page 2 of 4

Where are the instructions for accessing ODEQ's Aquarius and Bacti databases that you indicate are attached to the letter?

We have many more questions and concerns, but initially please help us understand what the State has done and what it is proposing.

Theresa

----Original Message----

From: Richard Garren [mailto:RGarren@riggsabney.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 1:32 PM

To: Scott McDaniel; Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Chris A. Tucker; Dara Mann; David Senger; Delmar Ehrich; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; James Graves; Jay Jorgensen; Jennifer Griffin; John Elrod; John Tucker; Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee; Lawrence Zeringue; Lori A. Whlte; Mark Hopson; Michael Bond; Nicole Longwell; P. Joshua Wisley; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Randall Rose; Raymond Lay; Richard Funk; Robert George; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Sherry P. Bartley; Stephen Jantzen; Steve Williams; Terry West; Theresa Noble Hill; Thomas Green; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson Cc: Bob Nance; dpage@edbelllaw.com; David Riggs; Doug Wilson; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Elizabeth Ward; Fred Baker; Jean Burnett; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Lee Heath; Louis Bullock; Melissa Carr; Randall Miller; Sharon Gentry; Sharon Weaver; Tina Izadi; Trevor Hammons; Jinger Waller Subject: RE: State ESI production

Scott,

The initial production by the State appears to be around 80 GB. Each of the defendant hard drives are being delivered with the States hard drive to RLS. I have a meeting this afternoon with representatives of RLS to identify the hard drives and the firms for each defendant that will likely be contacting them to arrange for the inspection of the State's data which is being produced in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a form or forms that are reasonably usable.

Each defendant can decide itself what if any material produced by the State it wishes to transfer to its respective hard drive. This will allow each defendant to control its own costs relative to the amount of material it desires to transfer.

When additional material is available from the state the State's hard drive will be repopulated and each defendant will be informed of the availability of the additional data. I would anticipate a general description of the material added will be given at that time.

Arrangements by the State for RLS should be completed this afternoon.

Rick

From: Scott McDaniel [mailto:smcdaniel@mhla-law.com]

Sent: Monday, July 02, 2007 5:51 PM

To: Richard Garren; Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Dara Mann; David Senger; Delmar Ehrich; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; James Graves; Jay Jorgensen; Jennifer Griffin; John Elrod; John Tucker; Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee; Lawrence Zeringue; Lori A. White; Mark Hopson; Michael Bond; Nicole Longwell; P. Joshua Wisley; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Randall Rose; Raymond Lay; Richard Funk; Robert George; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Sherry P. Bartley; Stephen Jantzen; Steve Williams; Terry West; Theresa Hill; Thomas Green; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Cc: Bob Nance; dpage@edbelllaw.com; David Riggs; Doug Wilson; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Elizabeth Ward; Fred Baker; Jean Burnett; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Lee Heath; Louis Bullock; Melissa Carr; Randall

RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

GREDORY W. ALBERTY
REBECCA V. AMENT
ILACK R. ANDERSON
THOMAS M. ASKEW
RYNN J. ASSON
LISA K. SEKKLE
DONALDM. BINGHAM
WILLIAM A. BOWLES
RICHARD B. BOYLE, IV
KELLY I. BRATCHER
PETER W. REBOLKK
STACE BRYZA
SCOTT W. BYRD
MICHAELLE M. CARTER
ILLI, C. HASE
DEBRICK D. CONYED
STEPHEN V. CORTES
MATTHEW P. CROCKH
ROGERT P. DEAN
GLENNAS. DORRIS
MATTHEW P. CROCKH
ROGERT D. BAN
GLENNAS. DORRIS
MATT J. GARBINT
RA L. EDWARDS. JR
GEORGE M. BARBEON
STEPHANE A. FLING
RICHARD A. GANN
BANT J. GARBINT
RICHARD A. GANN
BANT J. GARBINT
BREDDAN J. MAGGE
LONG M. MATT D. MATHESON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW FRISCO BUILDING 502 WEST SIXTH STREET TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74119-1010 (918) 587-3161 Fax (918) 587-9708

August 1, 2007

GLOYD L. MCCDY
RAYMOND A. MELTON
RICHARD A. MILDREN
OUSAR MOHAMEDHAI.
J. LYON MOREHEAD
J. NICE LOSA MOREHE
GORY L. NEW
GORETT A. NANCE
GARY L. NEW
JAMES C. ORDISON
NICOLE J. PETTY
WHITNEY D. PETTY
JAMES R. POLAN
RICHARD F. POORMON
DAY D. L. FRICE
VICTORIA L. RACKLEY
FRED RAHAL, BR.
LISA R. RICKIS
M. DAVID BIGGS
STEPHEN B. RILEY
MANDAL J. R. RINQUEST
MARY J. ROUNDS
GARRIELA N. SANDOVAL
WILLIAM C. SEARCY
ORDISON
DAVID A. STANDALLA
KERSTHEN E. RILEY
GARRIELA N. SANDOVAL
WILLIAM C. SEARCY
OLONGO
GARRIELA N. SANDOVAL
WILLIAM C. SEARCY
DAVID A. SEMENTAL
ROBERT P. SECTIII
DAVE SECTIII
DAVID A. SECTIII

KENNETH M. SMITH
SCOTT D. SMITH
ENTTY I. SOMMARS
ENTERLY A. STEWART
ENTERLY A. STEWART
ENTERLY A. STEWART
ENTERLY A. ENTERLY
DAVID H. THOMAS
AND H. THOMAS
REX W. THOMPSON
SOMA M. TREI
MOCHAEL C. TURPEN
LORDA VAN ARELE GREUHEL
KAZEN CARDEN WALEN
ENDA VAN WALEN
ENDA VAN WALEN
ENDA VAN GREUHEL
BERAY L. WITAKERSON
DOUGLAS A. WILSON
JERNY L. WITT
MICHAEL P. WOMACK
COURTNEY M. WOLD
TRACY S. ZUHL

Of Counsel Benjamin P. Abney E. Brysn Henson Pater J. Ragan

August 1, 2007

To All Defense Counsel Liaisons

Via e-mail

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, et.al, CV 05-03-0029

Dear Counsel,

The State is shipping by Fedex 6 DVD/CD's which contain the State's supplemental ESI production. The State is shipping the DVD/CD's to LuciData in accordance with Ms. Hill's request of July 27, 2007. The State's supplemental production contains the following:

- 1. OWRB-emails
- 2. ODEQ-emails
- 3. OSE-emails
- 4. ODAFF-Fertilizer, Feed, Pesticide and Nursery databases
- 5. OSRC-emails
- 6. OCC-emails (partial)
- 7. ODWC-emails and electronic reports, charts and photographs

provide dates dule. The State

EXHIBIT

The ESI for OCC will be provided at a mutually agreeable time at OCC. Please provide dates for your review at OCC and OWRB and we will work to accommodate your schedule. The State will provide the remaining OCC emails as soon as the review has been completed. Additional emails are being reviewed from ODEQ and e-mails from OCC are being reviewed a second time. We anticipate supplementing this review with OCC and ODEQ emails by August 8, 2007. The State will also be providing relevancy logs and privilege logs by August 31, 2007.

The State, during the course of its review of the agencies' emails, has discovered that some potentially responsive emails have been deleted at ODEQ and OWRB. The State is investigating if and when these emails can be recovered and, to the extent responsive and non-

August 1, 2007 Page 2

privileged, subsequently produced to the Defendants, as well as the circumstances of the deletions. By August 8, 2007 we will be informing the Court and Defendants the details of what we know as to what was deleted and how this came to happen. The State will also provide the Defendants with an update on whether the deleted emails can be recovered.

The State will be sending under separate cover a letter in response to Defendant's letter of July 12, 2007 and our meet and confer regarding the State's ESI production.

Sincerely

FOR THE FIRM

RTG/jds



Office of Attorney General State of Oklahoma

September 4, 2007

To All Defense Counsel

VIA E-Mail

Re: <u>State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods</u>, et.al, CV-00329-GKF-SAJ, ESI Relevancy Logs

Dear Counsel:

The State is continuing to review its ESI production for documents responsive to Defendants' Interrogatories previously served upon the State and will further supplement its discovery responses as documents are identified. The State has identified to date the following ESI (see attached "ESI Responsive Table") that is responsive to the various Interrogatories served upon the State. The State incorporates its original and supplemental Interrogatory objections and responses as if stated fully herein.

Sincerely,

J. Trevor Hammons

Assistant Attorney General

Jues Hammers

EXHIBIT

21

ESI RESPONSIVE TABLE

September 4, 2007

DATABASE	RESPONSIVE TO:
Aquarius (ODEQ)-contains sampling data for	Tyson Chicken Int. No.1
the IRW by county (Cherokee, Adair,	Tyson Chicken Int. No.2
Delaware and Sequoyah Counties)	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 5
	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 6
·	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 7
	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 8
4	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 9
	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 10
	Cobb Vantress Int. No. 1
	Tyson Foods Int. No. 5
	Tyson Foods Int. No. 7
	Tyson Foods Int. No. 8
	Tyson Foods Int. No.11
	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 9
	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 10
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 7
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 8
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 16
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 9
	Cargill Inc. Int. No.10
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 11
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 12
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 13
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 14
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 15
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 16
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 17
	Peterson Int. No. 6

BACTI (ODEQ)-contains bacteria data for the IRW by county (Cherokee, Adair, Delaware	Cobb-Vantress Int. No.1 Cobb-Vantress Int. No.2
and Sequoyah Counties)	Cobb-vantiess int. No.2
	Tyson Chicken Int. No. 4
	Tyson Foods Int. No. 10
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 8
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 12
	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 16
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 8
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 9
	Cargill Inc. Int. No.13
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 12
:	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 14
	Cargill Inc. Int. No 15
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 16
	Cargill Inc. Int. No.17
	Peterson Int. No. 6
AEMS Data (ODAFF) contains grower	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 4
information	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 5
	Cargill Inc. Int. No. 17
	Cobb-Vantress Int. No. 5
	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 2
	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 5
	Peterson Interrogatory No. 2
	Peterson Interrogatory No.3
	Peterson Interrogatory No. 11
·	Peterson Interrogatory No. 16
	Peterson Interrogatory No. 21
D. D. 1 (07)	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 5
Dairy Database (ODAFF) contains Dairy	
Dairy Database (ODAFF) contains Dairy information	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 3
	Tyson Poultry Int. No. 3 Cargill Turkey Int. No. 5

Seed, Feed, Fertilizer and Nursery Permit Database (ODAFF)	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 5 Tyson Poultry Int. No. 3 Peterson Int. No. 23
Seed, Feed and Tonnage Database (ODAFF)	Cargill Turkey Int. No. 5 Tyson Poultry Int. No. 3

VERIFICATION

STATE OF OKLAHOMA)	
	•	ss:
COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA)	

I, Miles Tolbert, being of legal age, hereby depose and state that I have read the foregoing supplemental responses to these interrogatory and that they are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I furnish such supplemental responses based on consultation with the representatives of the State of Oklahoma based on documents identified as of the date of this response.

Miles Tolbert

Secretary of the Environment

State of Oklahoma

Signed and subscribed to before me on this \(\frac{\pmathcal{M}}{\pmathcal{M}}\) day of September, 2007

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 11/09/10

My Commission Number:

02017963

02017963 EXP. 11/09/10

EXHIBIT

22

		4	***************************************		
4.		entertainment of the second of	rsla Zoole Wirelaw Helo		Type a question for Leip. ▼ _ z
3		1.714 0.35	つ 乳 対 計 り 直っ	(A) K & D D . 0 B	
٦	S=D	LAB TES	TID TEST	R ID DATE ANALYZED CODE	RESULT:::
1	39662	9602	1 PA/PA	D6/18/2002	0 39652 Shidter
1	39663	9602	1 PA/PA	06/11/2002	0 39663 Thomas MHP
3	396 54	9602	1:PA/PA	96/11/2002	D 39654 Alius
	39665	9602	1:PA/PA	06/11/2002	.O 39665 Altus
	223019	3007	1 PA/PA	10.09/1996	O No coliform organisms were found in this sample. Therefore, the water is compared to the control of the co
1	300102	30007	1 PA/PA	08/06/2003	0
1	300103	30007	1 PA/PA	08/06/2003	0
ì	300106	30007	1 PA/PA	08/06/2003	Ö
4	300107	30807	1 PA/PA	08/06/2003	0
4	16716	30010	2 EC/PA	06/30/2003	0
4	44541	9602	2 EC/PA	05/14/2003	0 44541 Guthrip
4	613590	30001	1 PA/PA	07/08/2003	D ABSENT No coliform organisms were found. The requirement is zero col
1	E13591	30001	1 PA/PA	07/08/2003	ABSENT No coliform organisms were found. The requirement is zero col
	613692	30001	1 PA/PA 1 PA/PA	07/02/2003 07/08/2003	O ABSENT No coliform organisms were found. The requirement is zero col
1	613593 613594	30001 30001			0 ABSENT No coliform organisms were found. The requirement is zero col 1 PRESENT One or more coliform organisms were found. The requirement
1	517364 517364	30001	1 PA/PA 1 PA/PA	07/08/2003 06/14/2003	1 PRESENT One or more coliform organisms were found. The requirement 1 PRESENT One or more coliform organisms were found. The requirement
d	517365	30001	1 PA/PA	D8/14/2003	O ABSENT No collision organisms were found. The requirement is zero col
4	617366	30001	1 PA/PA	08/14/2003	1 PRESENT One or more coliform organisms were found. The requirement
1	410444	3001	1 PA/PA	10/30/1996	One or more contains adjacement water bund, the requirement No coliform organisms were found in this sample. Therefore, the water is co
ł	63/6	9803	1 PAPA	92/24/2003	O PO LUNGIN ORGANISHS WERE TOOM IN HIS SAMPRE. AMERICAE, THE WANTE IS CO
t	6377	9903	1 PA/PA	02/24/2003	0
ŀ	6378	9803	1 PA/PA	02/24/2003	0
ł	6379	9803	1 PAPA	02/24/2003	0
1	44924	9602	1 PA/PA	06/11/2003	D 44924 Reintree
1	44975	9602	1 PAPA	06/11/2003	D 44925 Tonkawa
i	223054	30007	t PA/PA	10/09/1996	O No coliform organisms were found in this sample. Therefore, the water is co
1	48325	30004	1 PA/PA	07/16/2002	D
ĺ	48325	30004	2 EC/PA	07/18/2002	0
i	48326	30004	1 PA/PA	07/16/2002	B
ĺ	378	9914	1 PA/PA	09/30/2003	8
ľ	379	9914	1 PA/PA	09/30/2003	Ö
ŀ	18071	30010	2 EC/PA	02/10/2003	
ľ	19072	30010	1 PA/PA	02/10/2003	0
ľ	16072	30010	2 EC/PA	D2/18/20C3	
Į.	18073	30010	1 PA/PA	02/10/2003	
1	16073	30010	2 EC/PA	02/10/2003	
ĺ.	18074	30010	1 PA/PA	02/10/2003	0
l	18074	30010	2 EC/PA	02/10/2003	
1	18075	.30010	1 PA/PA	02/1C/2003	0
Į.	18075	30010	2 EC/PA	02/10/2003	
ı	18075	30010	1 PAPA	02/10/2003	
ı.	18076	30010	2 EC/PA	02/10/2003	
	16077	30010	1 PA/PA	02/16/2003	D
Į.	18077 18078	30010	2 EC/PA 1 PA/PA	02/10/2003	
				02/10/2003	
١	16078 16079	30010 30010	2 EC/PA 1 PA/PA	02/10/2003	
ŀ			I:PAPA	CARVILLAND CONTRACTOR	manda da manana da manda da manana da man
	ard(14 [4] [**	1 2 2 2 2	(60. ra.v.er.v.er.g.fravillizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionilizionili	

		74/12 記録 1971							<u> </u>	
		LAB			MSIS_ID DATE_COLLECT	D IS WELL	IS SPECIAL		NOT MSIS COLLECTO	
<u> </u>	71319	30008 PWS	01/26/2003	65	1020902 01/28/2003			0 0		E۱
	71320. 602416	30008 PWS	01/26/2003	55	1020902 01/26/2003			0 0		5\
	602417	30001 WV	01/31/2003	9	0 01/30/2003	<u></u>		0 0		12
<u> </u>	602417	30001 PWS	01/31/2003	26;	0 01/30/2003	D	<u> </u>	0 0		47
4	602418	30001 PWS	01/31/2003	75	3007506 01/30/2003	0	<u> </u>	0 0		LC
1	602420	30001 CZ	01/31/2003 01/31/2003	<u>76</u>	2007630 01/30/2003		<u>ក</u>			G
	602421	30001 CZ	01/31/2003	37 42	0 01/31/2003 E002/15/10 0		<u>u</u>	0 0		6.
	602421	30001 CZ	01/31/2003			. 	<u>H</u>	0 0		11
1	17786	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	55 14:	0.01/31/2003 2001413 12/10/2002	ţ.l	0	0 0		62
	17787	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002			0 0		Al
	17789	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	,				0 0		C
	17789	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002		44.	0 0		
1	17790	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002 2001413 12/10/2002			0 0		R
	17791	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002					FE
ļ	17792	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002			.0		E
ļ	17793	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002			D 0		В
	70961	3000E PWS	12/17/2002	55	1020902:12/17/2002			0 0		0
	70962	30008 PWS	12/17/2002	55	1020902 12/17/2002			0 0		N
*****	70963	30000 PWS	12/17/2002	55 55	1020902 12/17/2002			0 0	CH	N
	70964	30000 PWS	12/17/2002	55	1020902 12/17/2002			8 0	CH	Ņ
	70965	30008 PWS	12/17/2002	55	1020902-12/17/2002			0 0		N
	502665	30001 PWS	02/04/2003	14	2001412 02/04/2003		0	0 0		N 1
	602666	30001 PWS	02/04/2003	14	2001412 02/04/2003	6		ė ö		
	602667	30001 PWS	02/04/2003	14	2001412:02/04/2003	0	0	0 0	to a contract to disconstructions	3
	17794	30010 PWS	12/10/2002	14	2001413 12/10/2002		;			14
	502423	30001 PWS	01/31/2003	34	1011201 01/31/2003	.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0 0	anno antiga de la compresa de la co	Y
	1355	9604 PWS	01/21/2003	16	3001601-01/21/2003		Ð	0 0	Ц.	Ę
	1356	9604 PWS	01/21/2003	16	3001601 01/21/2003				DL DL	В
	1357	9604 PWS	D1/21/2003	16	3001601 D1/21/2003	, 		0 0	DL	B
	1358	9604 PWS	01/22/2003	15	3001501 01/22/2003			0 0	DL	В
	1359	9604 PWS	01/23/2003	16	3001601 01/23/2003			1	Dt.	R
	1360	9604 PWS	01/27/2003	15	3001601 01/27/2003	of the firms			DL DL	R
·	582615	30001 PWS	05/13/2002	69	1020504 05/13/2002	0	0	0 0		
	510523	30001 PWS	06/02/2003		2000805 06/02/2003	Ö			DR DR	E
	610524	30001 PWS	06/02/2003	63	2006309 06/02/2003	Ö	0	0 0	GWT	R
	610525	30001 PWS	06/02/2003	25	3002607 06/02/2003				ЫR	R
	581059	30001 PWS	04/22/2003	<u>37</u>	3003703 04/22/2002	0	. D :0	0 D		C
	585344	30001 PWS	06/13/2002	46	2004816-06/12/2002	0	. u	0 0		
	585345	30001 PWS	06/13/2002	48	2004816 06/12/2002	Ö	.u .0	0 0		5
	595346	30001 PWS	06/13/2002	48	2004816 06/12/2002	0	n	0 0		S
	585347	30001:PWS	06/13/2002	32	1020903 06/12/2002	0	0	0 0		C
	411350	30001 PWS	11/06/1996	14	2001413 11/05/1996	D D	0	0 0		با \$0
w 1140.00	411351	30001 PWS	11/06/1996	14.	2001413 11/05/1996	<u>D</u>	0	0 0		10
· · · ·	72224	30008 PWS	04/29/2003	55	1020902 04/28/2003			0 0		1U 45
	72225	30008 PWS	04/28/2003	 55	1020902 04/26/2003	,		0 0	MW	AS N
	72226	30005 PWS	D4/2B/2003	55	1020502 04/28/2003			0 0	how	N N
	72227	30000 PWS	04/26/2003	K.5	1020907 04/26/2003		- 11-1	0 0	MW	
	16 1	5 F 1 1 1 2 2 3	MANAGER OF STREET	55		Tak be are treated to		Transcrivers	Contract to the same of the dispressions.	W

	SAMPLED REMARKS	DATE FIRST E	DENTER TO	BUDIT CALIDIE	r	La Parago en la companya de la companya del companya del companya de la companya			
<u>"</u>	The second secon	derent river	MHIED: LC	MACH SHWELE	ST ASSN IDENT CD	I SAMP TYPE	SAMP REJ CODE STAG ID	STAT_ID	AD SAMPNUM
			Ÿ						
		02/03/2003	N		(+
		02/03/2003	N			#1'			
تہا	Dy TO DENIE BOUROR	02/03/2003							i
E z	DPY TO DENIS SCHROD XX TB 405-936-9479	02/03/2003	·					j	
lci		02/03/2003	N.				A. 1848		
C.	C 1809	02/03/2003			·				
7			v			· 	ļ		<u> </u>
		·	Ÿ			;:			ļ
			Y	***************************************			<u> </u>		ļ
			Υ				4·:·	-{	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
ļ			γ				h		
١.			Y						/····
			у					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			- Y						
			Y		Control of Light	1.		. [
			J		***************************************				
*		•							
	**************************************		······································						
*****		02/05/2003	:Y	····				-	
		02/05/2003	Y						
	***************************************	02/05/2003	Y					. [
			. Υ						
		02/03/2003	Υ						
	***************************************		·Υ					1	
			· Y						
			У						
			N N						
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1	
		05/14/2002					<u> </u>		
		06/03/2003	· Y						
	4	06/03/2003	Υ						_
		05/03/2003	Y				No. 2011	4	-
		04/23/2002	Y					·	
:		06/14/2002	Υ	- 7			*	1	
		06/14/2002	ΥΥ					1	
		06/14/2002	Y						
,		06/14/2002 11/14/1996	Υ						
A		11/14/1996	······································			i			
~ ~		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Y						
			Y						
			Ý						
			Ý				<u> </u>	4	

United States District Court NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

1. STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel. W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT, in his capacity as the Trustee for NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)))))))	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.) 05-CV-0329 TCK-SAJ	
 Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Cobe-Vantress, Inc., Aviagen, Inc., Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Cal-Maine Farms, Inc., Cargill, Inc., Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, George's, Inc., George's Farms, Inc., Peterson Farms, Inc., Simmons Foods, Inc., and Willow Brook Foods, Inc., Defendants. Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff,)))))))))))))))))))	
v.)) ;	
CITY OF WESTVILLE AND CITY OF TAHLEQUAH,)		
Third Party Defendants,)		
and)		EXHIBIT
TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY, INC. TYSON CHICKEN INC.		23

COBB-VANTRESS, INC., GEORGE'S, INC., GEORGE'S FARMS, INC., PETERSON FARMS, INC., SIMMONS FOODS, INC., AND WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,	;
Third Party Plaintiffs,	
ν.	1
CITY OF TAHLEQUAH, ET AL.,)
Third Party Defendants.)

CARGILL, INC.'S AMENDED FIRST INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO PLAINTIFFS

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P., Rules 33 and 34, Separate Defendant Cargill, Inc. requests that Plaintiffs answer the following interrogatories and produce the following requested documents and information at the offices of counsel for Cargill, Inc., Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones, Tucker & Gable, P.L.L.C., 100 W. 5th St., Ste. 400, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74103 within 30 days of service hereof.

DEFINITIONS

"Cargill, Inc." or "Any Cargill Entity" means Cargill, Inc. and its affiliated companies (including but not limited to Cargill Turkey Production, LLC and Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation), subsidiaries or divisions, and any employee, attorney, agent or other representative thereof.

"Complaint" or "Amended Complaint" refers to Plaintiffs' current, active pleading setting forth the basis for their claim(s) for relief which, at the date of service of these interrogatories and requests, is Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

"Document" includes every item and form of data discoverable under the applicable statutes and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Document means the original (or an identical duplicate if the original is not available), and any non-identical copies (whether non-identical because of notes made on the copies or attached comments, annotations, marks, fax transmission notations, or highlighting of any kind), of writings of every kind that are fixed in any physical medium. Documents include files, folder tabs, and labels appended to or containing any Documents. Examples of Documents include, but are not limited to:

Instructions

- Please refer to definitions when a defined term is used.
- 2. Unless otherwise indicated, words in the singular include the plural, and vice versa.
- 3. An Interrogatory or Request that uses the word "and" or the word "or," instead of the phrase "and/or" shall be construed as if it uses the phrase "and/or" if doing so would affect the breadth of the Interrogatory.
- 4. Please sequentially number each Document produced in response to these Interrogatories and Requests and specify which paragraph or subparagraph the Document relates to.
- 5. If You withhold any information on grounds of privilege (including but not limited to the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrine), provide a privilege log identifying each withheld document and setting forth the privilege claimed, and describe in detail the facts upon which Your claim of privilege is based.
- 6. Unless otherwise indicated, these interrogatories and requests seek information and documents within the geographic region of the Illinois River Watershed.
- 7. Unless otherwise indicated, these interrogatories and requests seek information and documents from the time period 1952 to present, as that is the date range alleged by Plaintiffs to be appropriate for the purposes of discovery.
- 8. These Interrogatories and Requests are continuing in nature and should You discover additional information or Documents responsive to these Interrogatories or Requests at any time through trial, You are directed to promptly furnish such information or Documents to the undersigned. Cargill, Inc. may object to any attempt by You to rely on or admit into evidence any information or Document encompassed by these Interrogatories or Requests but not timely produced.

INTERROGATORIES

Interrogatory No. 1: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 43 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity "so dominates and controls the actions and activities of its respective poultry growers that the relationship is not one of independent contractor, but rather one of employer and employee or one of principal and agent, and one of owner, operator or

arranger of poultry waste under CERCLA" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 2: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶¶ 13-14 of Your Amended Complaint that "[any Cargill entity] . . . is responsible for the poultry waste created by [] poultry growing operations, its handling and storage, and its disposal on lands within the IRW and the resultant injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 3: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 31 of Your Amended Complaint that "[any Cargill entity], by virtue of [its] improper poultry waste disposal practices, [is] responsible for this pollution of, as well as the degradation of, impairment of and injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 4: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 44 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity "[knew] and [] had reason to know that in the ordinary course of the poultry growers raising birds in the usual and prescribed manner poultry waste will be handled and disposed of in such a manner to cause injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 5: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 48

that any Cargill entity "has long known that it has been and continues to be the practice to routinely and repeatedly improperly store the poultry waste generated in the course of its respective growing operations on lands within the IRW" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 6: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 50 that any Cargill entity "has long known that the application of poultry waste to lands within the IRW, in the amounts that it is applied, is in excess of any agronomic need and is not consistent with good agricultural practices and, as such, constitutes waste disposal rather than any normal or appropriate application of fertilizer" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 7: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 52 that any Cargill entity "has long known that these poultry waste disposal practices lead to the run-off and release of large quantities of phosphorus and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants in the poultry waste onto and from the fields and into the waters of the IRW" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 8: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 58 that any Cargill entity "has long known that poultry waste contains a number of constituents that can and do cause harm to the environment and pose human health hazards" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

law (including, but not limited to, an alleged violation of 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-105 or 2 Okla. Stat. § 2-18.1) and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 14: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation contained in Count 5 of Your Amended Complaint that the conduct and acts of any Cargill entity constitute a nuisance under federal law and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 15: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶¶ 100, 112, 113, 115 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity has caused and is causing "unreasonable and substantial danger to the public's health and safety" in the Illinois River Watershed and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 16: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 6 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity has committed trespass under applicable state law and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 17: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 8 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity violated 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7 and Oklahoma Administrative Code § 35:17-5-5 and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Request for Production No. 1: Produce all documents identified or referenced in Your Answers to Cargill, Inc.'s First Interrogatories served contemporaneously herewith.

Request for Production No. 2: Produce all documents relied upon by You to support Your Answers to Cargill, Inc.'s First Interrogatories served contemporaneously herewith.

Request for Production No. 3: Produce all documents alleged to support Plaintiffs' claims in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & GABLE, PLLC

BY:_

JOHN H. TUCKER, OBA #9110 COLIN H. TUCKER, OBA #16325 THERESA NOBLE HILL, OBA #19119

100 W. Fifth Street, Suite 400 (74103-4287)

P.O. Box 21100

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100

Telephone:

918/582-1173

Facsimile:

918/592-3390

DELMAR R. EHRICH DARA D. MANN FAEGRE & BENSON LLP 2200 Wells Fargo Center 90 South Seventh Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Telephone:

612/766-7000

Facsimile:

612/766-1600

United States District Court Northern District of Oklahoma

1. State of Oklahoma, ex rel.)	
W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his capacity a	s Ì	
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF	Ś	
OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA SECRETARY	í	
OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,	,	
in his capacity as the Trustee for	,	
	Ì	
NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE)	
STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	05-CV-0329 TCK-SAJ
)	
1. Tyson Foods, Inc.,)	
2. Tyson Poultry, Inc.,	í	
3. Tyson Chicken, Inc.,	í	
4. COBB-VANTRESS, INC.,	í	
5. AVIAGEN, INC.,	'	
6. CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.,	,	
• •	,	
7. CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.,)	
8. CARGILL, INC.,)	
9. CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)	
10. George's, Inc.,)	
11. George's Farms, Inc.,)	
12. PETERSON FARMS, INC.,)	
13. SIMMONS FOODS, INC., and)	
14. WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,	j	
	í	
Defendants.	í	
 	1	
CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)	
CARCIEL TORKET TRODUCTION, LEC,	,	
Third Dorty District)	
Third Party Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
CITY OF WESTVILLE AND CITY OF)	
Tahlequah,)	
)	
Third Party Defendants,	j	
•	í	
and	í	
	1	
TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY,	1	
Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc.,	1	
TOO E AND IN CHILDING TARE,	1	

CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC'S AMENDED FIRST INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO PLAINTIFFS

Pursuant to FED.R.CIV.P., Rules 33 and 34, Separate Defendant Cargill Turkey Production, LLC ("Cargill Turkey") requests that Plaintiffs answer the following interrogatories and produce the following requested documents and information at the offices of counsel for Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones, Tucker & Gable, P.L.L.C., 100 W. 5th St., Ste. 400, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74103 within 30 days of service hereof.

DEFINITIONS

"Cargill Turkey" or "Any Cargill Entity" means Cargill Turkey Production, LLC. and its affiliated companies (including but not limited to Cargill, Inc. and Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation), subsidiaries or divisions, and any employee, attorney, agent or other representative thereof.

"Complaint" or "Amended Complaint" refers to Plaintiffs' current, active pleading setting forth the basis for their claim(s) for relief which, at the date of service of these interrogatories and requests, is Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

"Document" includes every item and form of data discoverable under the applicable statutes and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Document means the original (or an identical duplicate if the original is not available), and any non-identical copies (whether non-identical because of notes made on the copies or attached comments, annotations, marks, fax transmission notations, or highlighting of any kind), of writings of every kind that are fixed in any physical medium. Documents include files, folder tabs, and labels appended to or containing any Documents. Examples of Documents include, but are not limited to:

Interrogatory No. 9: State completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 53 that "[a]t many locations, phosphorus and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants have built up in the soil to such an extent that, even without any additional application of poultry waste to the land, the excess residual phosphorus and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants will continue to run-off and be released into the waters of the IRW in the future" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

<u>Interrogatory No. 10:</u> Provide a detailed description of the subjects of discoverable information held by each of the persons listed on Exhibit A of Your Initial Disclosures.

<u>Interrogatory No. 11:</u> Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 9 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity is subject to Oklahoma Administrative Code, 35:17-3-14.

Interrogatory No. 12: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 9 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity violated Oklahoma Administrative Code, 35:17-3-14 and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 13: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 142 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity has "avoided the costs of properly managing and disposing of their poultry waste— not only to their enormous economic benefit and advantage, but also at great cost to the lands and waters comprising the IRW and at the expense of, and in violation of,

the State of Oklahoma's rights" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 14: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 35 of Your Amended Complaint that "[t]he contracts establishing the growing arrangements between [any Cargill entity] and [its] poultry growers are presented to the poultry growers with no opportunity to negotiate their essential terms, and constitute contracts of adhesion" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 15: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 51 that any Cargill entity "has long known that the application of its poultry waste to lands within the IRW, in the amounts that it is applied and with the frequency that it is applied, far exceeds the capacity of the soils and vegetation to absorb those nutrients present in the poultry waste" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Interrogatory No. 16: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 54 that any Cargill entity "arranged for its respective growers to take possession of the poultry waste coming from its birds . . . with full knowledge that the growers were annually placing hundreds of thousands of tons of their poultry waste directly on the ground and that these actions would lead to the run off and release of phosphorus and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants into the lands and waters of the IRW" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely Interrogatory No. 17: and in detail the facts upon which You base the allegation contained in Count 10 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity was unjustly enriched by the State of Oklahoma and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely Interrogatory No. 18: and in detail the facts upon which You base the allegation contained in ¶¶ 107, 118, 126 of Your Amended Complaint that "Exemplary and punitive damages should ... be awarded" against any Cargill entity and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Produce all documents identified or referenced in Request for Production No. 1: Your Answers to Cargill Turkey's First Interrogatories served contemporaneously herewith.

Request for Production No. 2: Produce all documents relied upon by You to prepare or support Your Answers to Cargill Turkey's First Interrogatories served contemporaneously herewith.

Produce all documents provided by You to any Request for Production No. 3: Expert You expect to call as a witness in the trial of this Lawsuit.

Request for Production No. 4: Produce all documents relating to the identification. determination, calculation and amount of damages You are seeking to recover in this Lawsuit.

Request for Production No. 5: Produce all documents relating to any exercise of eminent domain by the State with respect to any tract of real property situated in the Illinois River Watershed.

Request for Production No. 55: Produce all documents related to costs allegedly incurred by Plaintiffs to monitor, assess and evaluate water quality, wildlife and biota within the Illinois River Watershed.

Request for Production No. 56: Produce all documents supporting Your contention that hormones and/or hormonal supplements, including but not limited to estradiol, are provided to poultry grown in the Illinois River Watershed.

Request for Production No. 57: Produce all communications between You and any poultry integrator regarding the Illinois River Watershed.

Request for Production No. 58: Produce all documents alleged to support Plaintiffs' claims in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES,

TUCKER & GABLE, PLLE

BY:

JOHN H. TUCKER, OBA #9110

COLIN H. TUCKER, OBA #16325

THERESA NOBLE HILL, OBA #19119

100 W. Fifth Street, Suite 400 (74103-4287)

P.O. Box 21100

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100

Telephone:

918/582-1173

Facsimile:

918/592-3390

DELMAR R. EHRICH

Dara D. Mann

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

2200 Wells Fargo Center

90 South Seventh Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Telephone:

612/766-7000

Facsimile:

612/766-1600



OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF OKLAHOMA

May 29, 2007

To all Counsel of Record

Via E-mail

Re: State of Oklahoma's Representation in State v Tyson Foods et. al, 4:05-cv-00329-TCK-SAJ

Dear Counsel:

This letter is being sent in accordance with the Court's Order on May 17, 2007 (Dkt #1150). The State of Oklahoma is the plaintiff in this action. For the purposes of discovery in this litigation and without waiving any objection to any particular request or discovery, discovery sought from any Oklahoma Executive branch agencies, boards and commissions, as well as Oklahoma state Universities should be served on the Office of Attorney General. A list of State agencies, boards, and commissions may be found at www.ok.gov/agencies.php (see attached). Discovery requests directed at the Oklahoma Judiciary or the Oklahoma Legislature should be served directly on those entities, and not through the Office of Attorney General. The Office of the Attorney General does not in this litigation represent county entities as they are separate political sub-divisions. Per my email exchange with counsel for Defendant Peterson I will be sending under separate cover a letter outlining the circumstance under which the Attorney General may represent the State Legislature or Judiciary.

Sincerely,

J. Trever Hammers
Trevor Hammons

Assistant Attorney General

Environmental Protection Unit

EXHIBIT

24

Page 38 of 47

----Original Message----

From: Philip Hixon [mailto:phixon@mhla-law.com]

Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 10:36 AM

To: George, Robert W.; Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Chris A. Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Noble Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor,

We are also still waiting for an explanation of the State's position that, at least for purposes of the Attorney General's instant lawsuit, the Office of Attorney General does not represent the Oklahoma Legislature. Thank you.

Philip D. Hixon, Esq.
McDaniel, Hixon, Longwell & Acord, PLLC
320 South Boston Avenue
Suite 700
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-3706
918.382.9200 Office Phone
918.382.9282 Facsimile
phixon@mhla-law.com



This message and the documents attached to it, if any, is intended only for the use of a client of McDaniel, Hixon, Longwell & Acord, PLLC and may contain information that is PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL, and may contain ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this

communication in error, please delete all electronic copies of this message and its attachments, destroy any hard copies you may have created and notify the sender immediately.

From: George, Robert W. [mailto:Robert.George@KutakRock.com]

Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 9:30 AM **To:** Trevor.Hammons@oaq.ok.gov

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor,

Now that we have all surfaced from last week's hearings, can I expect to get a response from you to the e mail below? If you are not going to respond further, simply report that and I will take the steps necessary to resolve this issue through the court. Thank you.

From: George, Robert W.

Sent: Monday, June 11, 2007 11:01 AM **To:** Trevor.Hammons@oaq.ok.gov'

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor,

I am well aware of the rules relating to the admissions by agents (whether public or private agents) and scope of authority. I am not asking you to commit that anything said on any subject by an unidentified employee at an unidentified agency is an admission. My question rather is on the preliminary point of which agencies, boards or commissions are considered "parties" for purposes of their ability to make an admission. If they are not parties, then we don't even get to the question of whether or not the particular statement was made within their scope of authority or not. See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 801(d)(2).

What I am looking for is a clear statement of which agencies, boards or commissions are considered "parties" for all purposes in this lawsuit. I don't believe the State can claim that some agencies are parties "for purposes of discovery" but not parties for making admissions or for other purposes related to this lawsuit. If this is the position the State is taking, I need to know it now. Please advise.

From: Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov [mailto:Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov]

Sent: Monday, June 11, 2007 10:30 AM

To: George, Robert W.

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov;

Page 3 of 9

John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Robert,

Please see attached the State's response.

J. Trevor Hammons
Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Unit
313 N.E. 21 St.
Office: (405) 522-2801
Fax: (405) 522-0608

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

This e-mail message is intended for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately and delete the original message.

"George, Robert W." <Robert.George@KutakRock.com>

06/08/2007 02:16 PM

To "David Page" <DPage@edbelllaw.com>, <Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov>

Page 4 of 9

West" <terry@thewestlawfirm.com>, "Trevor Hammons" <thammons@oag.state.ok.us>, "Theresa Hill" <thill@rhodesokla.com>, "Timothy Webster" <twebster@sidley.com>, "Vicki Bronson" <vbronson@cwlaw.com>

Subject RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

David / Trevor,

May I assume that neither of you will answer my question, now twice posed, below? Please advise so that I may pursue other avenues if necessary in getting this important issue resolved. As you know, the identity of "the plaintiff" in this case will be important on many legal issues including in determining what deposition testimony constitutes admissions by a party.

From: George, Robert W.

Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 4:52 PM

To: 'David Page'; Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

David.

Wasting time is certainly not anything I am interested in and if the question has been clearly answered, then someone simply needs to point that out to me and I will move on. Perhaps you can do so.

If you have Trevor's letter and e mail in front of you, please tell me what agencies, boards, commissions or people constitute or comprise the "State of Oklahoma" (the plaintiff) for purposes of this lawsuit? Trevor has told me who he believes he represents "for discovery purposes" but he has not directly addressed the question of who are parties to this action. Any assistance you can provide in moving us past this discussion would be greatly appreciated.

From: David Page [mailto:DPage@edbelllaw.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 4:41 PM

To: George, Robert W.; Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller;

Page 5 of 9

Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Robert, do you really think that we need anymore time, ink or kb wasted on this subject? I believe Trevor's letter and email answers are quite consistent, clear and to the point. Is it possible that something more productive could now occupy this small part of the information highway? Thanks for your thoughtful consideration. David.



David P. Page, Esquire

P.O. Box 1769

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101-1769

Phone: (918) 398-6800 Facsimile: (918) 398-6885 email: dpage@edbelllaw.com

Confidentiality Notice:

This message is being sent by or on behalf of a lawyer. It is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, or confidential, or otherwise legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete all copies of the message.

From: George, Robert W. [mailto:Robert.George@KutakRock.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 4:04 PM

To: Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor,

It seems like a simple question. Can you give me any idea as to the likely timing of a response?

Page 6 of 9

From: George, Robert W.

Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2007 4:20 PM **To:** 'Trevor.Hammons@oaq.ok.gov'

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor.

Your clarifying e mail leaves me more confused than I was before. Let's try it this way. What agencies, boards, commissions or people constitute or comprise the "State of Oklahoma" (the plaintiff) for purposes of this lawsuit?

From: Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov [mailto:Trevor.Hammons@oag.ok.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2007 3:30 PM

To: George, Robert W.

Cc: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Delmar Ehrich; Dara Mann; Doug Wilson; David Page; David Riggs; David Senger; Fred Baker; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov; John Elrod; James Graves; Jennifer Griffin; Jay Jorgensen; John Tucker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Louis Bullock; Lee Heath; Elizabeth Ward; Lori A. White; Lawrence Zeringue; Melissa Carr; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Patrick Ryan; Randall Rose; Richard Funk; Richard Garren; Randall Miller; Bob Nance; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Raymond Lay; Sherry P. Bartley; Sharon Gentry; Stephen Jantzen; Scott McDaniel; Steve Williams; Sharon Weaver; Thomas Green; Terry West; Trevor Hammons; Theresa Hill; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Subject: RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Robert,

I have received your e-mail. Just to be clear, there is only one party-plaintiff in this lawsuit. It is the State of Oklahoma. The Office of Attorney General represents the State of Oklahoma in this action. For purposes of discovery in this litigation discovery sought from any of the agencies, boards and commissions listed on my letter of May 29th should be served on the Office of Attorney General. Of course, we are not waiving any objections the State might have to any discovery served by Tyson or its co-defendants (e.g., relevancy) or, further down the road, any objections the State might have to the fruits of any such discovery (e.g., admissibility). We will address each discovery request that we receive and will promplty inform you if you have served discovery on what the State contends is a third party. I hope this clarifies the issue, if it does not then please send me a letter with your questions so that we may formally respond.

Trevor

Page 7 of 9

J. Trevor Hammons
Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Unit
313 N.E. 21 St.
Office: (405) 522-2801
Fax: (405) 522-0608
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

This e-mail message is intended for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately and delete the original message.

"George, Robert W." <Robert.George@KutakRock.com>

06/05/2007 02:01 PM

Subject RE: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Trevor,

This will confirm our telephone conversation this afternoon in regard to your May 29, 2007 letter (attached). During the call you agreed that the executive branch agencies, boards and commissions covered by your letter should be considered parties (i.e., part of the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma) for purposes of this action. I appreciate that clarification.

Page 8 of 9

From: Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov [mailto:Jean.Burnett@oag.ok.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2007 6:03 PM

To: Bruce Freeman; Bruce Jones; Colin Tucker; Dara Mann; David Senger; Delmar Ehrich; Gary V. Weeks; George Owens; James Graves; Jay Jorgensen; Jennifer Griffin; John Elrod; John Tucker; Lawrence Zeringue; Lori A. White; Mark Hopson; Bond, Michael R.; Nicole Longwell; Patrick Ryan; Paula Buchwald; Philip Hixon; Randall Rose; Raymond Lay; Richard Funk; George, Robert W.; Robert Redemann; Robert Sanders; Scott McDaniel; Sherry P. Bartley; Stephen Jantzen; Steve Williams; Terry West; Theresa Hill; Thomas Green; Timothy Webster; Vicki Bronson

Cc: Bob Nance; David Page; David Riggs; Doug Wilson; Elizabeth Claire Xidis; Elizabeth Ward; Fred Baker; Julie Zielinski; Kelly Burch; Lee Heath; Louis Bullock; Melissa Carr; Randall Miller; Richard Garren; Sharon Gentry; Sharon Weaver; Trevor Hammons

Subject: State of Oklahoma Letter Re: Representation

Jean Burnett
Environmental Protection Unit
Oklahoma Office of Attorney General
313 NE 21st Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Office: (405) 522-3753
Fax: (405) 522-0608

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

This e-mail message is intended only for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. This message is or may be an attorney-client communication and as such privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

ANY FEDERAL TAX ADVICE CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE SHOULD NOT BE USED OR REFERRED TO IN THE PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING OF ANY ENTITY, INVESTMENT PLAN OR ARRANGEMENT, NOR IS SUCH ADVICE INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED, BY A TAXPAYER FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.

This E-mail message is confidential, is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is privileged, attorney work product or otherwise protected by applicable law. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at 402-346-6000 and delete this E-mail message. Thank you.

Case 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-PJC Document 1261-3 Filed in USDC ND/OK on 09/07/2007 Page 46 of 47

Page 9 of 9



Office of Attorney General State of Oklahoma

Robert George Kutak Rock The Three Sisters Buildings 214 West Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701

Via E-Mail

June 11, 2007

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, Inc.et al, Case No. 05-cv-329-GKF-SAJ

Dear Robert:

I believe that I have answered the question as to who is the plaintiff in this lawsuit completely and fully. As explained in the letter of May 29, 2007, it is the State of Oklahoma that is the plaintiff, and for purposes of this litigation the State will respond to discovery directed at its executive agencies, boards and commissions, as well as State Universities. Your statements that you do not understand this or are confused by it have not helped me understand how my letter is not a complete and full answer to this question. I remain convinced that our answer is complete, precise and easily understood.

The question which you now pose as to who can make admissions on behalf of the State of Oklahoma is a much more complex question and one that is not amenable to being answered in the context in which you raise it. As you can appreciate the questions of who has the authority to bind a sovereign and what is the scope of that individual's or agency's authority are quite different than the same questions being asked as to corporations or private individuals. The issue of the ability of a state actor to act or speak in a manner that will bind the State is always a matter of the individual's or agency's legal authority, the scope of that authority, and even the procedures followed prior to the statement or action. Given these limits the authority of any individual or agency to speak on behalf of the sovereign state of Oklahoma must necessarily be decided on the basis of specific facts.

I hope that this is helpful.

Sincerely,

J. Trevor Hammons
Assistant Attorney General

EXHIBIT

26

